

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 19, 2006. Claims 1, 5-20, 22-34, 110-114, 125, 126 and 128-134 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 5, 22, 110, 112 and 125 are in independent form. Claims 1, 5-14, 22-26, 28-33, 110, 112-14, 125, 126 and 128 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regards as their invention. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Initially, it is noted that the Patent and Trademark Office has still not provided confirmation that the Office has recognized the removal of Mr. Suga as an inventor. Such confirmation is again respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 5-20, 22-34, 110-114, 125, 126 and 128-134 were rejected solely under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the *Mackinlay* document of record.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a linked data display method for displaying data items managed with given linkages thereamong. This method comprises displaying data items included within a similar level of linkage position simultaneously in a substantially same size, and displaying first data items, and second data items linked to the first data items, which are not included within the similar level of linkage position mutually distinguishably in different sized determined according to a distance of a linkage between the first and the second data items. According to Claim 1, the data items represent time-series data picked up time-sequentially, and displayed so that the distance of a linkage between the displayed first and second data items corresponds to an interval from a pick-up time of the first data items to a pick-up time of the second data items.

As one example, the data items might represent work done in the past, if the application is a time-keeping system, and the “pick-up times” of the data items might be the dates on which the work was done. Again, in a scheduler, the data items might be future times for which things have already been planned, and the “pick-up times” might be simply those future times (in this case, of course, the term “pick-up” time is not perfectly exact). In a photo processing application, they could be individual photographs, or sets of index information corresponding to photographs, with the pick-up time of each data item being the time at which the corresponding photograph was taken.^{1/}

Among other notable features of the method of Claim 1, therefore, are that the data items displayed in the two recited displaying steps are time-sequential ones, and that the display size of a given data item is determined by the pick-up time of that data item (that is, the time at which the data item was acquired; in the case of photographs, as noted above, this could be the time at which the photograph was made).

Mackinlay is not believed to teach these features. *Mackinlay* relates to a number of techniques for presenting calendar information, relating to either the past or the future, to a user in such a way as to permit the user to view the information at whatever level of detail is needed, while presenting a visually-intuitive relationship among different hierarchical levels of the information. These levels may be months, weeks within a given month, individual days within a week, and time slots within a single day, by way of example. In the view provided in Fig. 3, *Mackinlay* shows a time slot from 2:30 to 3:30 p.m. on a specified day, August 17, 1993, in the lower left-hand portion of the screen.

^{1/} It is of course to be understood that the claim scope is not limited by the details of this or any other particular embodiment that may be referred to.

Nearby is a smaller view, showing the day from which that time slot is taken, and additional, successively smaller views show the week in which that day occurs, the whole month, and the entire year. These views are arranged in a spiral with the smallest (year) in the lower right of the screen, and extending counterclockwise to the largest in the lower left.

Claim 1, as noted, recites “displaying first data items, and second data items linked to the first data items, which are not included within the similar level of linkage position mutually distinguishably in different sized determined according to a distance of a linkage between the first and the second data items”. Thus, to read Claim 1 on *Mackinlay*, it would appear that the first data items and the second data items of the claim must correspond to the various items corresponding to different hierarchical levels of time in *Mackinlay*, the first data item being, for example, the time slot 2:30 to 3:30 on August 17 (the largest), and the second being one of the others, for example the item showing the entire day, that is above and smaller than the time-slot.

Claim 1 also recites, however, that “the data items represent time-series data picked up time-sequentially, and displayed so that the distance of a linkage between the displayed first and second data items corresponds to an interval from a pick-up time of the first data items to a pick-up time of the second data items”. It is not seen how this recitation is met by anything in *Mackinlay*.

First, it is not seen in what way it could be said that these different objects shown in the view of Fig. 3 of *Mackinlay* constitute “time-series data picked up time-sequentially”, as recited in Claim 1. *Mackinlay* does not teach a display showing, in one screen, multiple objects like the time-slot that appears at the bottom left, or showing

multiple objects like the one at the top center of the screen representing the entire day of August 17, 1993, much less actual “time-sequentially” picked-up data items, as recited in Claim 1.

Moreover, there is certainly nothing in the Spiral Calendar of Fig. 3 of *Mackinlay* that would teach or suggest displaying multiple data items “so that the distance of a linkage between the displayed first and second data items corresponds to an interval from a pick-up time of the first data items to a pick-up time of the second data items”. Differences in placement and size among the data objects shown in Fig. 3 of *Mackinlay* relate to different hierarchical levels of time (single time slot versus whole day, day versus week, week vs. month, etc.), and not to different times at which the respective data were themselves picked up.

For all these reasons, it is submitted that Claim 1 is clearly allowable over Fig. 3 of *Mackinlay*, and the corresponding description. While the Office Action indicates that the entire disclosure of *Mackinlay* is relevant to the language of Claim 1, it appears to Applicant that the Examiner considers Fig. 3 to be by far the most relevant portion of that article. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is allowable over *Mackinlay* as a whole.^{2/}

Independent Claim 5 is directed to a time-series data display method for displaying accumulated time-series data items. That method comprises displaying first data items associated with a first time in which the first data items have been picked up, in

^{2/} Should the Examiner maintain this rejection, he is respectfully requested to provide Applicant with a more detailed explanation of the way in which he considers the specific features discussed in *Mackinlay* to apply to the language of Claim 1.

a first size, and displaying second data items associated with a second time following the first time and in which said second data items have been picked up, in a second size different from the first size, so that a change of size between the first and second sizes corresponds to a temporal direction between the first time and the second time.

Claim 5 is believed to be clearly allowable over *Mackinlay* for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 1.

Each of the other independent claims in this application is either an apparatus or a computer program product claim corresponding to one or the other of Claims 1 and 5, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with the latter claims.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Applicant notes, however, that many or most of the recitation in the dependent claims also are not met by *Mackinlay*, as far as Applicant can see. For example, Claim 7, ultimately dependent from Claim 5, further recites that "the first data items are displayed at an outermost position in a display screen, and the second data items are displayed *inside the first data items* with a display area thereof made smaller [emphasis added]." Even if the time-slot and the whole-day portions of the view in Fig. 3 of *Mackinlay* are deemed for argument's sake to correspond to the first and the second data

items of Claim 5, nothing in *Mackinlay* appears to suggest even remotely a plurality of objects like the time-slot one, and a plurality of objects like the whole-day one located inside the time-slot objects.

Again, Claim 15, dependent from Claim 5, further recites that “graphics such as rings or squares representing dates associated with displays are nested and displayed together with representations of data items.” Nothing has been found in *Mackinlay* that is seen to teach or suggest such graphics, much less that different rings or different rectangles should be displayed in different colors, as is recited in Claim 31.

In any event, since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 587785v1